

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-11 and 13-15 are currently pending in this application and stand rejected.

The claims have been rejected as detailed below.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,128) (hereinafter referred to as "Knee") in view of Hendricks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,134,131) (hereinafter referred to as "Hendricks") and further in view of Krzyzanowski et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0053447) (hereinafter referred to as "Krzyzanowski").

Claims 11 and 13-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Krzyzanowski.

The above-mentioned rejections are traversed for the following reasons.

As admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action, Knee does not disclose "the use of a reception information, capable of receive, select, and forward each and every choice of broadcasting data." The Examiner cited Hendricks as teaching this feature, and specifically asserted that Hendricks teaches "in Figure 11 of a scheduling website and a network controller." Moreover, the Examiner asserted that "this also shows the use of an authorization system capable of receiving and forwarding the requested broadcasting programming desired."

However, in contrast to the present invention as recited in claim 1, Hendricks describes a broadcast digital television environment 131 including a network controller 214, as the controller of a local cable system 114, which provides digital broadcast programming to subscribers. The network controller 214 receives programming 115 from a broadcast affiliate 112 or directly from a national broadcaster 110. Programming 197, provided by controller 214, may include a local authorization code 197' to subscribers of the local cable system 114. The authorization code 197' is provided in response to an order placed by a subscriber, and is formatted such that it can be interpreted only by the terminal to which it is addressed. A set top terminal 220 receives the programming 197 and may provide programs for display on a television 170 (see col. 24, lines 36-60).

Thus, Hendricks does not describe a remote control apparatus that contains a receiving unit for recording on a recording medium, included in the remote control apparatus, information transmitted from a program selecting apparatus. Moreover, Hendricks does not describe a

remote control apparatus including a forwarding unit which is for transmitting the information after a second user operation has been received from the remote control apparatus. Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Hendricks to modify the broadcast digital television environment 121 to include a remote control device that contains a receiving unit and a forwarding unit.

Consequently, Hendricks does not describe a remote control apparatus that includes *a requesting unit for transmitting to a program selecting apparatus via a transmitting unit, a signal for requesting a piece of reception information that corresponds to a selected program, when a first user operation has been received, and a reception information receiving unit for receiving and recording, onto the recording medium, the piece of reception information transmitted from the program selecting apparatus.* Moreover, Hendricks does not disclose *a forwarding unit for transmitting via the transmitting unit the piece of reception information recorded on the recording medium after a second user operation has been received*, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, it is believed clear that Hendricks fails to disclose or suggest the present invention as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the combination of Knee, Hendricks and Krzyzanowski, Krzyzanowski is relied upon in the rejection as disclosing a detection of the user pushing the operational button as a first user operation having been received and regards a detection of the operational button becoming released after the detection of the user pushing the operational button as a second user operation having been received. However, it is clear that Krzyzanowski also fails to disclose or suggest the above-discussed distinguishing features of the remote control apparatus recited in claim 1.

Regarding claims 11, 14 and 15, they are patentable over the references relied upon in the rejection for reasons similar to those set forth above in support of claim 1. That is, each of claims 11, 14 and 15 similarly include a remote control apparatus that receives a piece of reception information transmitted from a program selecting apparatus and transmits via a transmitting unit, the received piece of reception information after a second user operation has been received.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-discussed distinguishing features as recited in claims 1, 11, 14 and 15 are not disclosed in the

